Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-11 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, and 11 being the independent claims. Claims 2-5, 7 and 8 are sought to be amended. New claim 11 is sought to be added. The specification is sought to be amended to correct a typographical error. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

In the Claims

Claim 2 is amended to remove negative recitations.

Claim 3 is amended to remove unnecessary apparatus features from the method claims and to make minor grammatical corrections. Claim 3 is further amended to recite that the flight-prohibition data is read/written from/in the emergency sub-database (D2). Support for this amendment is found at, for example, the last paragraph of page 3 of the specification.

Claim 4 is amended to depend from claim 2 instead of claim 1, and to make minor grammatical corrections. Claim 4 is further amended to recite that the temporary piloting data is read/written from/in the emergency sub-database (D1). Support for this amendment is found at, for example, the second full paragraph of page 3 of the specification.

Claim 5 is amended to recite features performed by a main computer, including setting a value H. Support for this amendment is found at, for example, page 7 of the specification, beginning at line 16.

Claim 7 is amended to depend from claims 1, 2 or 4. Claim 7 is further amended to recite features found in the specification at, for example, page 4, beginning after the heading, "Embodiments," through page 5.

Claim 8 is amended to recite that the automatic pilot control is performed according to the flight data and the information of flight-prohibition area. Support for this amendment is found at, for example, page 5 of the specification, lines 10 through 16.

New claim 11 is directed to subject matter found throughout the specification.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry and examination is respectfully requested.

In the Specification

The specification is amended to correct a typographical error. Namely, the word "and" is replaced by the word "or." Applicant asserts that the PCT application, as originally filed in the Chinese language, utilizes the equivalent of "or." Thus, this change is believed to introduce no new matter.

Traversal of Restriction Requirement

According to M.P.E.P. Section 803:

> If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct invention.

According to the Examiner, claims 1-9 are classified in class 701, subclass 9, and claim 10 is classified in class 701, subclass 209. Applicant submits that the search of two

subclasses would not place an undue burden on the examiner within the meaning set forth by Section 803.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and requests that all claims be examined on the merits.

Conclusion

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply to Restriction Requirement and Preliminary Amendment is respectfully requested. Applicants believe the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Patrick E. Garrett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,987

Date: 9/12/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

440766_1.DOC